

'I want to skip your class': Being polite in Korean interlanguage requests

Jee-Won Hahn
(Kyung Hee University)

Hahn, Jee-Won Hahn. 2009. 'I want to skip your class': Being polite in Korean interlanguage requests. *Linguistic Research* 26(3), 161-179. This study is motivated by the recent involvement of polite speech in ESL textbooks (*ICON* and *Touchstone*) and class instruction. Language textbooks published in America have begun to recognize the dimension of polite speech vs. plain speech influenced by research on cross-cultural pragmatics. In this study, requests are associated with politeness (Brown and Levinson 1987) since this behavior gives imposition on the hearer and is a face-threatening act. Politeness is one concern for the selection of requests among a variety of speech behavior. This study examines the act of requesting in order to investigate how a request is politely realized and 48 responses are collected. Learners are asked to make a request in formal relationship where power and social distance plays a role. 48 Responses are collected from the survey. Findings are consistent with previous studies on Korean interlanguage requests in that a request is likely to be an interrogative (Searle 1975). On the other hand, culture-specific features indicate politeness is also realized by means of other linguistic devices as well as sentence types. Furthermore, use of speaker-oriented categories is highlighted in relation with sources of miscommunication. (Kyung Hee University)

Key Words politeness; requests; miscommunication; inter-language; Korean

1. Introduction

As research of cross-cultural communication has been expanding, study findings show a variety of distinctions that can be made due to cultural differences. Accordingly, in the language-learning environment, diverse forms of English are recognized in different situational factors such as setting (e.g., business English, travel English, public speaking English), genre (e.g., phone English, conversation English, movie English), and channel (e.g., spoken English, written English). These are types that result from drawing contextual and interactional factors. Among them, polite speech is another dimension which is taken into consideration in textbooks when teaching English. Lessons include

'Refuse offers politely' in *Touchstone* (Lesson 5), 'Ask for a favor politely' in *Touchstone* or 'Disagreeing politely but strongly' (Lesson 9) in *ICON*. The focus is to see how learners are able to accomplish politeness appearing in learning a language.

Acts such as requests, complaints, and suggestions are instances that appear in all language-learning textbooks. Among these, requests are significant in that they are intended to affect the hearer's behavior in such a way that they get the hearer to do something (Blum-Kulka 1992). After the specific class instruction is given, the performance of polite requests is carried out by Korean learners of English. This study examines how language learners are able to enhance their awareness of situational factors such as social settings and relationships when conveying politeness. Requests are examined regarding several aspects. Head acts (Section 4.1) and their mitigation devices (Section 4.2) are analyzed. Then, structure (4.3) is presented in order to see how requests categories are combined. Then, a small number of Korean native data are also reported in Section 4.4 further consideration.

2. Review of previous studies

2.1 Politeness theory

Politeness is concerned with face (i.e., an individual's self-esteem) and face wants. The need of a speaker to have his/her face respected in interaction requires efforts to reduce the impact of threats to that face. Brown and Levinson (1987) identify two aspects of individual face, namely their positive and negative face needs. Positive face needs include individuals' need to be approved of and liked by others, and to have their wishes and desires shared and respected. Negative face needs refer to an individuals' need for privacy and distance from others, and to have their autonomy and independence respected.

Interlocutors seek to save one's face and this want may cause to threaten the other's face. They adopt linguistic politeness strategies to consider the face needs of their addressees.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) propose a set of politeness strategies to cope with threatening acts. Many interactive acts constitute a potential threat to face and the speaker tries to reinforce politeness or mitigate a face-threatening act.

When the negative face of the addressee or hearer is threatened, the speaker will make use of such negative politeness strategies as the use of in-group identity markers, address forms, jargon and slang, being indirect, adopting hedging devices, or apologizing. Positive strategies emphasize friendliness towards and solidarity with the speaker including the use of in-group identity markers, address forms, jargon and slang.

Concepts such as threats and politeness strategies are criticized for the reasons that they are too egocentric based on individual societies (Wierzbicka 1985; 1991). Wierzbicka (1985) points out that threats are likely to depend on the speaker's perception. And she proposes caution to analyze cultural values underlying the perceptions of threats in different cultures. Blum-Kulka (1987) and Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) developed analytical framework for communicative activities. Brown and Levinson's model is considered too limited to explain politeness in non-Anglo socio-cultural contexts. For methodology, Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) and Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) devise instruments termed as discourse completion tests. Their concern is to gather the speakers' differences as regards the interpretations of the same speech acts realized by different groups of speakers.

2.2 The speech act of requesting

Speech act theories classify requests in terms of categories according to directness. An utterance becomes indirect as much as its meaning drawn from context. As the utterance contains fewer words to refer to the target speech act, it has to depend on context. According to Searle (1975), the indirect illocution of the sentence ('I wonder if you would mind leaving the room') is required as a more polite directive rather than an imperative ('Leave the room.').

A request has been defined as a directive speech act in which the speaker asks the hearer to perform an action which is for the benefit of the speaker (Trosborg 1995). Therefore, requests are one of face-threatening acts in Brown and Levinson (1987)'s politeness theory, since they intrinsically threaten the hearer's face. In order to minimize the threat and to avoid the risk of losing face, there is a preference for indirectness on the part of the speaker issuing the request to smooth the conversational interaction. Direct requests appear to be inherently face-threatening and for polite behavior these face-threatening acts are

likely to be indirect. The requester may save face by using mitigating devices.

Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) developed nine categories to be comprehensive based on three levels of directness: direct strategies, conventionally indirect strategies, and non-conventionally indirect strategies. These nine categories are adopted in many request studies (Kasanga 2006; Trosborg 1995) as they are used in the Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Performance (CCSARP).

Table1: Blum-Kulka et al. (1989)'s request categories

Level of directness	Category	Example
Direct	1. Mood-derivable	Stop playing game
	2. Explicit performative	I am telling you to...
	3. Hedged performative	I have to ask you to leave
	4. Obligation statement	You must stop now
Conventionally indirect	5. Want statement	I'd like to borrow the pen
	6. Suggestory formula	Let us play a game
	7. Preparatory	Would you give me a pen?
Non-conventionally indirect	8. Strong hit	The game is boring
	9. Mild hint	We've played for an hour

The nine category-based framework has been very influential in request studies and when it is adopted, it may be modified. For instance, for Korean, five category-based framework was proposed (Byon 2004) (1) preparatory (2) strong hints (3) polite direct (4) want statement (5) mood-derivable. In this coding system, categories involving performative verbs are shown to be simplified considering application of speech act studies to non-English speaking societies. While English involves high rates of use of performative verbs, non-western languages show low rates of use. Considering different linguistic means varying between languages, the CCSARP coding system may be modified.

Findings coming from L2 empirical studies recurrently reveal difficulties in acquiring pragmatic competence. Without particular instruction, speaking appropriately is hard to achieve and likely to be a pragmatic failure. (Thomason 1983). From a pedagogical perspective, attempts to incorporate findings in cross-cultural pragmatics and language teaching are growing (Cohen 2005 Davis 2004 Uso-Juan and Martinez-Flor 2008). They have developed methods in order to bring effective progress since pragmatic competence requires conscious

attention. Uso-Juan and Martinez-Flor (2008) propose a method consisting of three different stages requiring different activities (i.e., a learner's exploration, production, and feedback). Conscious efforts are recognized in order to achieve pragmatic competence unlike grammatical competence.

2.3 Studies on Korean requests

Most studies on Korean requests (Byon 2004; Han 2005; Kim I-O 2000; Kim J. 1995; Kim H-K 2007; Koo 2001; Suh 1997; Suh 1999) are found in L2 pragmatic performance in order to see linguistic realization patterns across cultures. These studies mainly consisting of two or three groups, native speakers of Korean, those of American English, and Korean learners of English focus on comparing the groups and finding out differences between native speakers and non-native speakers. A comparison of speech act realization patterns in completing items in the DCT brought consistent results. Korean interlanguage request pragmatics tends to prefer the form of interrogative sentence, preparatory ('Could I ...'; 'Would it be okay') which belong to the intermediate degree of directness, conventionally indirect request.

Since most studies were carried out in L2 pragmatics, considering the effects of variables is another main concern. Variables such as experience (Han 2005), power (Byon 2004), and social distance (Suh 1999) are taken into account to properly examine the data. In learning a foreign language, situational factors are found to play a role in Korean learners of English. Kim (2007) examined two developmental factors: subjectivity and pragmatic transfer, and found their effects on the linguistic realization of requests. Regarding verbosity, compared to native speakers of language, Korean learners tend to speak more and their speech is lengthened (Byon 2004) following the pattern of inter-language verbosity.

The third issue is to test the universal claim on directness. This type of studies highlights the evidence from Korean contrary to theoretical assumptions. According to politeness theory, being indirect is a major way of being polite for face-threatening acts including requests (Searle 1975; Brown and Levinson 1987). However, studies analyzing Korean native data reported the preference of direct forms. These studies argue that politeness is not necessarily realized by means of sentence types it can be realized by means of other linguistic devices.

In Byon (2006), the most preferred is direct request accompanied by honorific

words and sentence endings. Yu (2004) illustrates examples that are direct but also provide the politeness needed. Suh (1997) tested directness by means of perception task. Nine different request strategies are given in order to study the preference of strategies and Suh's study supports previous findings on the preference of direct requests. Preference for direct requests in Korean is found in the comparative study with Chinese (Rue & Zhang 2008) as well as Korean native data. In Rue and Zhang's study, Koreans are found to use direct requests using a honorific system while the Chinese use an indirect sentence.

3. Data collection

The data on requests come from the survey conducted in ESL classes at the end of the semester. It was carried out before the final exam during the last class of the semester. The survey termed as Pragmatic Awareness Questionnaire aimed to evaluate second language achievement of English pragmatics in order to see how students understand English pragmatics and develop comparing the initial stage of the class and the final stage of the class. By looking at students' performance of English pragmatics, the survey examined whether language learners are able to use 'English-like' way of conveying messages appropriately and how much they maintain the target form after classes come to an end. The purpose of the survey was to see the pragmatic development compared to the initial stage of the class in order to see students' awareness and understanding English pragmatics.

To elicit speech, it is common to fabricate an offense and set up situations where someone may react. In the area of cross-cultural pragmatics, the benefit of using a Discourse Completion Task (DCT) lies in collecting a lot of data in a short time. The problem with a DCT is lack of variety of situations and naturally-occurring speech because made-up situations are used. This method does not allow researchers to consider contextual factors and only typical situations are selected. In this study, the questionnaire includes five representative speech situations and students were asked to write appropriate responses for each situation. These typical situations were selected out of the textbook, *Touchstone 3* including situations such as requesting a professor, refusing an invitation to eat, and closing a conversation. The present study focuses on the act of requesting (Situation 4 in the Appendix). The situation

given in the survey is the following:

You are supposed to go for an interview and have to miss a class. You see your professor and tell him about the interview and ask him if you could miss the class. What would you say to get his permission to miss class?

The survey was conducted in three university level courses taught by the author and a total of 81 students participated. The level of English language proficiency ranges from beginning and intermediate. Most students major in engineering and arts such as chemistry, physics, and design. These students do not get much access to learning English. The test was conducted anonymously to relieve pressure associated with grading and evaluation. The instruction does not require any personal information. Participation was voluntary and students were asked to explain themselves thoroughly. A total 48 responses were collected consisting of 44 responses in English and 4 responses in Korean, respectively.

4. Results: Request realizations in Korean English

4.1 Request head acts

Requests can be analyzed in two parts: head acts and mitigating devices. According to Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), head acts refer to the request proper or the main strategy employed to make the request. In the current study, requests in Korean English (KE afterwards) are realized in seven categories such as preparatory, need statement, or plan statement illustrated in Table 2. These categories can be divided into interrogatives and declaratives. Preparatory refers to the interrogative type of requests by asking the other's willingness, permission, or opinion. When a request is not realized in an interrogative, declarative sentence type requests are used which vary according to modal verbs. These categories include speech acts such as stating need for a favor, expressing want, informing someone of a plan or the possibility of an event.

Table 2: Request head acts

<i>Categories</i>	<i>Examples</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
Preparatory	Would you mind…	27	51%
Need statement	I have to go.	11	20%
Plan statement	I'll miss your class	4	8%
Possibility formula	I can't attend the class	3	6%
Want statement	I would like to …	2	4%
Wish formula	I wish I could go	1	2%
Begging	Please professor	1	2%
Total		49	100%

The most common form is preparatory occurring 51%. While an interrogative sentence is used to ask for information, the conventional indirect requests may function as directives rather than inquiries though they are in the form of interrogatives and their literal meanings seek to ask about the hearer's ability and willingness to perform the act respectively. The requester is likely to choose the form querying the other's opinion. Preparatory is realized by modal verbs 'could' or 'would.' Interrogatives may be embedded in the main clause ('I was wondering if…'). Examples of this are illustrated as in (1).

- (1) a. Could I miss a class because I go for an interview?
- b. Would you mind if I miss the class due to interview?
- c. I was wondering if I could miss class because I have an interview that day.

The second most common category is need statement occurring 20%. Stating need and obligation is mainly realized by means of the modal verb 'need' and 'have to' as illustrated in (2). To reinforce purpose, the verb 'must' is used as in Example (2.c).

- (2) a. I need to go to the company for an interview.
- b. Excuse me professor. I have to miss the class because I go to the interview.
- c. I have an interview today so I must skip your class.

Want statement belongs to minor categories in the current data while this

category is one of the major categories in previous request studies(Blum-Kulka et al. 1989). One feature is the frequency of need statement rather than stating one's want or desire. This can be accounted for in relation with the situation tested in the current study. In a situation between student and professor relationship, the person in lower status is likely to choose need statement rather than want statement. In stating the fact, the person in lower status is likely to be polite by attributing to the inevitable situation. Example (4) illustrates this.

- (4) I want to skip your class for job interview. Is that ok?

As a variation, wishing for the target act appears in one instance. Expressing wish may be taken as a way of expressing want by Korean learners.

- (5) Could you do me a favor? I wish I could go for an interview.

Plan statement is realized by the modal verb 'will.' Predicting the future plan or reporting the coming event is a way of indicating the force of requesting as in (6).

- (6) a. I'll have an interview today so I'll miss your class. I'm sorry.
b. Excuse me I will be absent your class.

Possibility formula is realized by modal verbs 'could' or 'can.' Here, we can see the speaker's intention to be polite by stating possibility. Not being assertive may function as mitigating the force of requesting.

- (7) a. I could miss a class because I have an interview.
b. I have an interview to take. So I can't attend the class next time.

In the current data the use of declaratives is striking. When the data are divided into sentence types, they consist of interrogatives and declaratives. Interrogatives consist of one main category, preparatory occurring 27 times out of 49 (54%). Most categories realized by use of modal verbs belong to declaratives.

Table 3: Sentence types

<i>Sentence types</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
Interrogatives	27	54%
Declaratives	22	46%
Total	49	100%

Declaratives can be termed as speaker-oriented approach since they start with the first person pronoun 'I.' Use of declarative sentences which are all realized by means of the first pronoun 'I' occurred on 22 (46%) occasions. Even for interrogative sentences, utterances to ask for permission involve the first person pronoun, which is speaker-oriented. Example (8) illustrates this.

- (8) Can I miss a class, professor?

4.2 Mitigating devices of requests

Given the nature of request as an imposition, it is necessary to soften the impact it may have on the hearer by means of using mitigating devices. These devices refer to optional elements that may follow and precede the request head act. To modify requests, there are five main categories for supportive moves such as attention-getter, opener, apology, and title. The most common category is opener ('Can I ask for favor?'), which is the request for time or permission to talk. Attention getter ('Excuse me') and titles ('professor') are evenly used. For minor use, apologies and greetings are used.

Table 4: Request mitigating devices

<i>Categories</i>	<i>Examples</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
Opener	Do you have a second?	23	48%
Attention getter	Excuse me	10	21%
Title	Professor	10	21%
Apology	I'm sorry	3	6%
Greeting	Hi	2	4%
Total		48	100%

The category opener refers to opening items and expressions that introduce

the intended request. The frequency of openers mainly in the form of question asking for time or permission can be attributed to the instruction given in the class activity. The model conversation given in the class involves the expression 'Can I ask for a favor?' Favor-involving openers are realized in several forms appearing in (9).

- (9) a. Would you do me a favor?
- b. Can I ask for favor?
- c. I want to ask a favor.

Asking for time is another common form. Interrogative form can be realized in declarative forms as in (10.c).

- (10) a. Do you have a second?
- b. Can I talk to you?
- c. I'd like to talk

Most mitigating devices appear at the beginning of an utterance. These devices are combined maximally up to three categories at one instance. Attention-getter and titles come first and then, an opening expression involving favor is used as illustrated in (11).

- (11) attention getter + title + opener
- Excuse, professor. I wanna ask a favor.

For alternatives, attention-getter may be replaced by greeting in (12).

- (12) greeting + title + opener
- Hi professor. Can I ask you something?

Regarding position of mitigating devices, apology is the only category which appears at the end of an utterance as well as the beginning. Here, the speaker ends up with the request by apologizing in (13).

- (13) I'll have an interview today so I'll miss your class. I'm sorry.

4.3 Structure of requests

Request categories are likely to be combined at one place. A single category is used such as one type of request head act or one category of mitigating devices. Requests consisting of a single category occur in 15 out of 44. Many examples are multi-category based occurring 29 times. Example (14) illustrates the instance in which a single request category can be used without any mitigation. The speaker chooses one category and he/she ends up with one head act.

- (14) I was wondering, would it be all right with if I was late an interview.

The maximum number of head acts categories is mainly two categories. Requests are likely to start with one declarative category and end with the interrogative one asking for the other's willingness and permission. Mitigating devices may include three categories at once in the combination of attention-getter, title, and opener. Example (15) illustrates the complex structure of requests involving five categories at one place.

- (15) attention getter + title + opener + need statement + preparatory
 Excuse me professor I want to ask you a favor. I have an interview today so I must skip your class. Would that be okay?

4.4 Results of Korean results

Korean native data come from four responses in the current survey. The survey instruction was given to ask participants to respond in English and four responses are written in Korean, instead. According to the data from these responses, Koreans and KE speakers show similarities and differences. Both groups use preparatory for the choice of head act request. Most examples end up with asking for permission and willingness for the requested act, occurring 3 times out of 4. A difference is found in the choice of mitigating devices. The most common supportive move is apology (3 times out of 4, respectively). Title is the second common category in order to minimize imposition given on the act

of requesting. While opener(realized by the word *pwuthak* 'favor') is the most common in the KE data, apology and title are the most frequently used in the Korean data.

Table 5: Korean requests

Main parts	Categories	Number
Head acts	Preparatory	3
	Directive	1
Mitigating devices	Apology	3
	Title	2
	Opener	1

Example (16) illustrates the typical form of a Korean request consisting of title and apology for mitigation and preparatory for head acts.

- (16) 교수님 죄송하지만 인터뷰가 있어서 다음 수업 한번 빠질 수 있을까요?
kyoswu-nim coysong-ha-ciman inthepyu-ka iss-ese taum swuep
professor-HON sorry-be-but interview-NM be-because next class
hanpen ppaci-l swu iss-ul-kkka-yo
once miss-VS way be-VS-VS-Q
'Professor, I'm sorry but would it be possible to skip next class because
I have an interview?'

5. Discussion and conclusion

For the choice of request categories, this study confirmed the existing pattern (Byon 2004; Kim 2007; Suh 1997) since preparatory is the most preferable. Particularly, for the degree of directness, the preference for the intermediate stage of directness, conventionally indirect requests is obvious including preparatory. While previous studies adopted several categories ranging from direct and indirect ones (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989), all the categories used in this study only belong to conventionally indirect request which makes a request by using other speech acts such as preparatory, need statement, and plan statement. This fact indicates that the requester chooses to be not too direct or too indirect in formal

relationship.

According to the findings of previous studies (Byon 2004; Han 2005; Suh 1999), three request categories are preferred across different groups of languages. Among others, preparatory (an interrogative form of request) is the most common. Differences between Korean interlanguage and American English are in the rates of request categories. While Americans tend to use preparatory, Korean learners show relatively high use of directive forms (realized by means of declaratives). High rates of declaratives support similar patterns for Korean interlanguage.

The degree of directness is the main issue in speech act theory and politeness theory. To be polite, the Modal person is likely to choose an indirect form (Brown and Levinson 1987). However, according to this study, politeness can be realized by means of other linguistic devices such as the choice of modal verbs or honorific words or supportive moves. For instance, use of the modal verb 'could' is the case. Being uncertain and not being assertive is the polite intention assumed by Koreans. Secondly, speakers prefer to use need statement rather than want statement. Instead of stating one's desire, the common response is to attribute the source of favor to the inevitable situation, which can be also considered as polite to Koreans.

One notable feature in the KE data is the preference of speaker-oriented form (i.e., involving the first person pronoun 'I'). The use of declarative sentences is the case. Even though the most common request category is an interrogative, interrogatives are found to be very slightly higher than declaratives in requests. Many request head acts (which are realized by modal verbs including need statement or plan statement) are realized in declarative sentences and start with the first person pronoun. Even for interrogatives, sentences may involve the first person pronoun 'I' (e.g., 'Could I miss the class?').

On the other hand, being polite is associated with the extent to show concern toward the other based on personal communication with native speakers of English (who participated in the current study for proofreading). For this reason, hearer-oriented perspective (i.e., involving the second person pronoun 'you') is common in asking the other's willingness and for permission. Hearer-oriented features can be identified in the model dialogue presented in the textbook. This dialogue involves questions ('I was wondering if...') and the request made from the hearer's point of view ('would it be all right with you'). Under the lesson

"Asking for a favor politely", the model dialogue is given in the following excerpt.

Excerpt: Asking for a favor politely (Touchstone 3 p. 102)

Situation: You are an employee and want to take a day off. You ask your boss for a favor.

Todd: Excuse me. I was wondering if I could talk to you for a second.

Paula: Sure, let me just send this e-mail. All right. So what can I do for you?

Todd: Well, I wanted to ask for a favor, actually.

Paula: OK.

Todd: I was wondering, would it be all right with you if I took Friday off?

Cross-cultural difference may cause miscommunication in making a request. For instance, plan and possibility statement (realized as 'I will miss the class' or 'I can't come to the class) may be heard as an announcement rather than asking for a favor for the native speaker of American English. What is important in making a request is to consider the other and his/her time because the requester takes away the other's time. A polite request in English is to express thoughts and concern toward the other. In a situation where someone in low status speaks, KE requests realized by the use of modal verbs are perceived as 'demanding' to a native speaker of English. Even though the model conversation is given, language learners are likely to return to their first language after a certain period of time, being influenced by cultural pre-conceptions. KE learners mistakenly assume that polite speech is associated to linguistic devices which are available in their native language. Therefore it is necessary to not just teach politeness but to teach it with the target language's culture in mind.

References

- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1987. Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics* 11(2), pp.131-146.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1992. Metapragmatics of politeness in Israeli society. In R. Watts et al. (eds.). *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice*, pp.255-280.

- Berlin: New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana and Elite Olshtain. 1984. Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization pattern (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics* 5. pp.196-213.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Julian, House, and Gabriele Kasper. 1989. *Cross-cultural pragmatics*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byon, Andrew Sangpil. 2004. Sociopragmatic analysis of Korean requests: pedagogical settings. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(9), pp.1673-1704.
- Byon, Andrew Sangpil. 2006. Apologizing in Korean: Cross-cultural analysis in classroom setting. *Korean Studies* 29, pp.137-166.
- Cohen, Andrew D. 2005. Strategies for learning and performing L2 speech acts. *Intercultural pragmatics* 3(3), pp.359-364.
- Davis, Catherine Evans. 2004. Developing awareness of crosscultural pragmatics: The case of American/German sociable interaction. *Multilingua* 23. pp.207-231.
- Han, Sangkyung. 2005. The interlanguage pragmatic development of the speech act of requests by Korean non-native speakers of English in an ESL setting. Doctoral dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.
- Kasgnga, Luanga. A. 2006. Requests in a South African variety of English. *World Englishes* 25(1), pp.65-89.
- Kim, Hee Kyoung. 2007. The role of the learner subjectivity and pragmatic transfer in the performance of requests by Korean ESL learners. Doctoral dissertation. Texas A&M University.
- Kim, In-Ok. 2000. Relationship of onset age of ESL acquisition and extent of informal input to appropriateness and nativeness in performing four speech acts in English: A study of native Korean adult speakers of ESL. Doctoral dissertation. New York University.
- Kim, Julie. 1995. "Could you calm down more?": Requests and Korean ESL learners. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 11(2), pp.67-82.
- Koo, Dohee. 2001. Realizations of two speechacts of heritage learners of Korean: Request and apology strategies. Doctoral dissertation. The Ohio State University.
- Rue, Young-Ju and Zhang, Grace Qiao. 2008. *Request strategies: A comparative study in Mandarin Chinese and Korean*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Searle, John. 1975. Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, 59-82. New York: Academic Press.
- Suh, Jae-Suk. 1997. Pragmatic perception of politeness in requests by Korean learners of English as a second language. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching (IRAL)* 37(3), pp.195- 213.
- Suh, Jae-Suk. 1999. Interlanguage requests by Korean learners of English as a second language. Doctoral dissertation. Indiana University.
- Thomas, Jenny. 1983. Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics* 4(2), pp.91-112.

- Trosborg, Anna. 1995. *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints, and apologies*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Uso-Juan, Esther and Martinez-Flor, Alicia. 2008. Teaching learners to appropriately mitigate requests. *ELT Journal* 62(4), pp.349-357.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1985. Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts. Polish vs. English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9, pp.145-178.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1991. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yu, Kyong-Ae. 2004. Explicitness for requests is a politer strategy than implicitness in Korean. *Discourse and cognition* 11(1), pp.173-194.

Textbooks

- Freeman, Donald et al. 2005. ICON (International Communication Through English) 3. McGraw Hill.
- McCarthy, Michael et al. 2006. Touchstone 3. Cambridge University Press.

Abbreviations

- HON Honorifics
NM Nominal case particle
VS Verbal suffix
Q Question marker

Pragmatic Awareness Questionnaire

Instruction: Five situations are given below. Read the following situations and describe how you would react in that situation.

Situation 1

You're are late for a meeting and with a friend. You need to end the conversation. What would you say to bring about the end of the conversation?

Situation 2

A friend asks you to have something to eat. However, you just ate dinner and don't feel like eating anymore. What would you say to refuse the offer?

Situation 3

Someone says "It's too bad families don't eat together anymore." You disagree with this opinion. What would you say to support families not eating together?

Situation 4

You are supposed to go for an interview and have to miss a class. You see your professor and tell him about the interview and ask him if you could miss the class. What would you say to get his permission to miss class?

Situation 5

You accidentally bump into someone that you haven't met for a while. What would you say?

Jee-Won Hahn

Kyung Hee University
211-dong 401-ho
Hyundai I-Park 2-cha
Sengbuk-gu Chongam 1-dong 131-penci
Seoul, Korea
(02) 923-5855
jeewonh@gmail.com

Received: 2009. 11. 18

Revised: 2009. 12. 10

Accepted: 2009. 12. 23